



Title	シェンゲン情報システム（SIS）の現状と課題：「国境のないヨーロッパ」の国境管理とITシステム
Author(s)	須田, 祐子; 前田, 幸男
Citation	境界研究, 3, 1-13
Issue Date	2012-11-09
DOI	10.14943/jbr.3.1
Doc URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2115/61237
Type	bulletin (article)
Additional Information	There are other files related to this item in HUSCAP. Check the above URL.
File Information	01_summary_sudamaeda.pdf (英文要旨)

[Instructions for use](#)

Summary

The Schengen Information System (SIS): Policy Implications of Evolving IT System in “Europe without Frontiers”

SUDA Yuko, MAEDA Yukio

This article explores policy issues concerning the Schengen Information System (SIS) with a focus on the long overdue introduction of the second generation SIS II. It is argued that the resistance of participant states to the proposed “Europeanization” of the SIS has added to technological difficulties inherent in “updating” information technology (IT) systems.

The SIS is a computerized information exchange system that allows border management and law enforcement authorities to share data (“alerts”) on specific categories of persons and objects. Established by the 1990 Convention implementing the Schengen Agreements, the SIS went into operation in 1995 to compensate for the abolishment of internal border controls within the Schengen Area and to promote cooperative management of common external borders.

As such, the SIS was launched as an intergovernmental project among the signatory states of the Schengen accords. This intergovernmental mode of operation remained intact even after the entry into force of the 1995 Amsterdam Treaty, which incorporated the Schengen Aquis into the legal framework of the European Union (EU).

The original SIS was updated to the current SIS I+ when Nordic countries joined the Schengen regime in 1996. However, the SIS I+ was incapable of accommodating the countries that were expected to accede to the EU in 2004. Thus, the Council in 2001 decided that the SIS would be replaced with a second generation system.

Yet the migration to the SIS meant not only the enhanced system capacity but also the “Europeanization” of the SIS in terms of the development, management, and supervision of the project. Not surprisingly, several SIS participant countries insisted that they should maintain control over information that might be vital to policing and border management activities.

Conflict between intergovernmental and “European” models of the SIS project manifested itself in seemingly technical changes in the network architecture of SIS II. At the outset, the SIS II was planned as a centralized system with member states directly accessing data stored in the central system (Central SIS II). In response to pressure from participant states, however, the SIS was re-

Summary

designed and now has a more distributed, star-shaped structure with national components (N. SIS II), where participant governments have the right to possess copies of SIS data. The alternation entailed the revision of network requirements, resulting in further delay in delivering SIS II.

In sum, the recent developments of the SIS project suggest that borders have not disappeared in “Europe without frontiers” and that European states still claim authority over the movement of people into their territories.